

Midpoint Progress Report on Leadership Table Ad Hoc Subcommittee Work

Developed by the National Alliance to End Homelessness with support from Community Solutions

Introduction and Purpose of Leadership Table Ad Hoc Subcommittee Work.....	2
Leadership Table Ad Hoc Subcommittees.....	3
Current Point in Process.....	4
Progress on Shared Understanding of Metrics and Measurements.....	4
Highlights, Key Points of Progress, and Limitations.....	6
Goal 1: Increase the number of people moving from encampments into permanent housing to reduce unsheltered homelessness.....	7
Goal 2: Reduce the number of people with mental illness and/or substance use disorders who experience homelessness.....	9
Goal 3: Increase the number of people permanently leaving homelessness.....	11
Goal 5: Increase the number of affordable housing units in Los Angeles County.....	14
Equity Considerations.....	16
Next Steps.....	17
Appendixes.....	18
Appendix A: Members of Leadership Table Subcommittees.....	18
Appendix B: Key Terms Defined by Subcommittees.....	23

Introduction and Purpose of Leadership Table Ad Hoc Subcommittee Work

This memo provides a midpoint progress report on the work of the Leadership Table for Regional Homeless Alignment (Leadership Table) subcommittees,¹ which collectively are tasked with creating tangible, concrete “baseline and target metrics” that correspond to the five high-level goals that are established within the text of the Los Angeles County Affordable Housing, Homelessness Solutions, and Prevention Now Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance (Measure A).² When completed, these recommended metrics will provide clear, objective ways to track the region’s progress on addressing homelessness in a number of areas, including homelessness prevention, reducing unsheltered homelessness, increasing placements to permanent housing, and providing needed services and housing to people with mental illness and substance use disorders. In addition to providing an update on progress, this memo provides emerging recommendations from the subcommittees to the Leadership Table and the Executive Committee for Regional Homeless Alignment (Executive Committee).

The text of Measure A sets broad goal categories, such as “increase the number of people permanently leaving homelessness.” The task of the subcommittees is to bring these goals to life by doing several tasks which collectively constitute a recommended methodology for the goals:

- Establishing agreed-upon definitions and parameters for key terms³ that can otherwise have a number of different definitions with different implications for the data that is produced (such as ‘people with mental illness’ or ‘encampments’);
- Agreeing on data sources to be used to establish a common understanding of the current baseline for these goals, recognizing that homelessness touches a number of different systems that produce an array of data sources;
- Using the baseline data and well-defined terms, create metrics for each of the five Measure A goals, which can be used to judge progress at one- and five-year intervals;
- Create tangible numerical targets for each of the metrics.

Irrespective of the outcome of Measure A, which goes before Los Angeles voters on November 5, 2024, these goals can provide a common understanding and shared purpose for the many entities across the region working on addressing the homeless crisis. These goals and metrics can be used to align funding sources at the county or local level, creating a data-informed method for resource allocation and program implementation strategy. In response to direction

¹ Full list of subcommittee members can be found in Appendix A

² The text of Measure A directs that “The Executive Committee shall evaluate progress toward goals and no later than April 1, 2025, the Executive Committee and Housing Agency shall each formulate baseline and target metrics based on input and recommendations from the Leadership Table; relevant county staff; and stakeholders, including service providers contracted to provide services like those to be funded by the tax imposed by the Ordinance, affordable housing developers, and renter protection organizations.”

³ Full list of terms as defined by the subcommittees can be found in Appendix B.

from the Executive Committee, these goals will also both encourage the scaling of evidenced-based solutions to homelessness that work, while leaving space to experiment with bold ideas that drive the region forward, such as developing a comprehensive prevention system (see below in Goal 4 section).

With appropriate metrics agreed upon by leaders across the region, Los Angeles County residents will have a clear line of sight into whether the system is achieving its goals and if funding is producing results. This will provide more objective measures of the Los Angeles region's homeless response, regardless of what an individual street or encampment may look like from one week to the next.

Leadership Table Ad Hoc Subcommittees

The Leadership Table members elected to participate in three subcommittees, each of which is tasked with addressing between one and three of the Measure A goals: the Homelessness Response Subcommittee, the Homelessness Prevention Subcommittee, and the Affordable and Supportive Housing Subcommittee. Within some of these subcommittees, working groups were established to address individual goals or components within the goals. The Homeless Response Subcommittee divided into three groups, with each of the groups addressing one of Goals 1, 2, and 3. The Affordable and Supportive Housing Subcommittee also divided into three working groups, with the working groups addressing production, preservation, and access, respectively. Within each subcommittee, a number of subject matter experts who are not currently members of the Leadership Table were also invited to participate (see Appendix A for full list of subcommittee participants).

The Measure A goals and the corresponding subcommittees making recommendations for the methodology for each goal are as follows:

1. Increase the number of people moving from encampments into permanent housing to reduce unsheltered homelessness (*Corresponding Subcommittee: Homelessness Response*)
2. Reduce the number of people with mental illness and/or substance use disorders who experience homelessness (*Corresponding Subcommittee: Homelessness Response*)
3. Increase the number of people permanently leaving homelessness (*Corresponding Subcommittee: Homelessness Response*)
4. Prevent people from falling into homelessness (*Corresponding Subcommittee: Homelessness Prevention*)
5. Increase the number of affordable housing units in Los Angeles County (*Corresponding Subcommittee: Affordable and Supportive Housing*)

Current Point in Process

Each of the subcommittees met over the spring, summer, and early fall of 2024, each meeting up to a half-dozen times as subcommittees to make progress on establishing firm metrics for the goals. To date, each subcommittee has established recommendations on the common data sources that will form the baselines for their goals, shared definitions of the key terms used in the goal language or informing the goal, and in some cases a baseline measurement that will be used to judge progress in future years.

As the subcommittees have met to develop their goals and better understand both the possibilities and limitations of the existing administrative and survey data on homelessness, three distinct phases of the goal-setting process have emerged:

- Phase 1: Develop shared definitions of key terms, decide on data sources, create structure of a baseline data point for each goal, create metric to measure progress for each of the five Measure A goals;
- Phase 2: Develop structure of annual data report, test data sources to ensure feasibility of metrics, make recommendations for amendments to metrics where needed, create business rules for report, and establish numbers for baseline data points;
- Phase 3: Set numerical goals within each metric.

Over recent months, the subcommittees completed Phase 1. This report recommends formalizing the role of an Ad Hoc Data Subcommittee to complete Phase 2 between now and early 2025 (see below for more information on the Ad Hoc Data Subcommittee), with subcommittees completing Phase 3 in Q1 2025, bringing recommended numerical targets to the Leadership Table and Executive Committee.

As noted above, these goals and targets can guide the direction of the region's homeless response with or without the passage of Measure A, and can guide the allocation of other local, state, and federal resources. The passage of Measure A and the corresponding funding unlocked by the Measure will have significant impacts on the ambition and direction of the goals; should Measure A fail at the ballot, goals would likely be scaled back. But the outcomes of the goal-setting process can be utilized to guide strategy and resource allocation throughout Los Angeles County at any level of funding availability.

Progress on Shared Understanding of Metrics and Measurements

Historically, in Los Angeles and communities around the country, a lack of shared definitions, measurement, and metrics has created discord and a breakdown of regional efforts to address homelessness. When there is a disconnect between system leaders and policymakers, or between policymakers and the broader public on what constitutes "progress" and how to measure that progress, distrust and dissatisfaction with how public dollars are being used can grow.

Lack of a common understanding or shared goals contributes to an environment where sentiments that “we’ve taxed ourselves but it hasn’t made any difference” can flourish, despite critical investments and a system rehousing more people than ever before. Adding to this challenge is the reality that simple terms like “preventing homelessness” or “decreasing homelessness” elide the complexity of these concepts and the many different ways they can be defined or measured.

Arriving at shared definitions of these concepts and shared agreements on how to measure progress on these concepts is a major step forward in Los Angeles' effort to establish a unified regional vision. Shared definitions and agreed-upon metrics are an indispensable cornerstone for collective agreement on performance targets to inform Los Angeles' efforts to measure progress and understand the impacts of its investments. Moreover, this effort can help reconcile that the forces to push people into homelessness are largely outside of the control of the homeless response system (insufficient affordable housing, stagnant wages relative to rent growth), and measure and recognize the performance of what the homeless response system does control.

Key Recommendation: Data and Measurement—Ad Hoc Data Subcommittee

Throughout the process of developing metrics for the five Measure A goals, subcommittees needed access to subject matter expertise on the data sources available to calculate metrics and how they could be calculated. Members also raised the issue that metrics across subcommittees should be part of a cohesive set of combined metrics. For example, a reduction in inflow would reasonably decrease a future demand for housing, and those metrics should be connected to each other. To help anticipate and address these issues, the Los Angeles County CIO started to meet with the California Policy Lab at UCLA (academia representative) and USC (researchers leading the annual PIT count and demographic survey) to track these questions, synthesize the subcommittee's ideas, and start to translate those ideas into a potential reporting framework, forming an Ad Hoc Data Subcommittee.

This data subcommittee has recognized that, for many of the baseline data points discussed below, there are not currently regular reports that share these data points at a person-level. Additionally, this data subcommittee recognized the need for a team with deep understanding and facility with LAHSA and County data systems to identify possible limitations of recommended metrics and ensure feasibility and replicability of the metrics being recommended.

As noted by the Executive Committee, using data to establish baselines and track progress against goals in real-time must be approached with urgency. The Ad Hoc Data Subcommittee's work to analyze the recommended metrics, though slowing the process of reaching numerical goals at the current moment, is a vital step to eliminate potential delays and hurdles later in the process. In order to effectively track the progress of all five of the Measure A goals, the members of this data subcommittee recommend that the Executive Committee formalize and prioritize the work of this Ad Hoc Data Subcommittee and direct them to take several actions:

- Designate the Los Angeles County Chief Information Officer as the lead developer of an annual, person-level report to track and report out metrics that will be guided by the recommendations of the Leadership Table subcommittees;
- Meet regularly to develop the business rules and specific parameters of that report, including preliminary baseline measures for each goal, and begin testing those parameters with existing data sets to determine feasibility of reporting these metrics in an annual, person-level report;
- Report back to the Leadership Table and the Executive Table in January 2025 with a report format that matches the recommended metrics, includes preliminary baseline measures, and where necessary, recommend alternative metrics.

Highlights, Key Points of Progress, and Limitations

On each of the five goals, critical progress and decisions on recommendations to the Leadership Table and Executive Committee were arrived at. The following section highlights the most salient decisions made on each of the goals, with further information on the details of progress made in the sections that follow. Table 1 below details the metrics developed for each goal to date.

Table 1. Measure A Goals and Corresponding Metric	
Goal as Written in Measure A	Metric(s) Developed by Subcommittee
Goal 1. Increase the number of people moving from encampments into permanent housing to reduce unsheltered homelessness	Increase by xx% the number of people moving into interim and permanent housing from unsheltered settings, as measured through the PIT count, the encampment data tool and reporting groups experiencing unsheltered homelessness.
Goal 2. Reduce the number of people with mental illness and/or substance use disorders who experience homelessness	Reduce by xx% the proportion and total number of people experiencing homelessness with mental illness and substance use disorder.
Goal 3. Increase the number of people permanently leaving homelessness	Increase by xx% the number of persons who have exited homelessness to a permanent destination and have not returned after two years.
Goal 4. Prevent people from falling into homelessness	Reduce the number of people who become newly homeless (as measured in administrative data) by XX%.

Goal 5. Increase the number of affordable housing units in Los Angeles County

Reduce by xx% the baseline of unmet need (500,000-550,000 unit shortage for people with very low-incomes and below), with additional submetrics for production, preservation, and access.

Goal 1: Increase the number of people moving from encampments into permanent housing to reduce unsheltered homelessness

Corresponding Subcommittee: Homelessness Response

Critical progress on this goal included recommending a methodology for a baseline number, which will be used to measure year-over-year changes of people moving from encampments into interim and permanent housing. Developing this recommended methodology involved major decisions on data sources as well as key definitions. These decisions include:

Metric and Methodology—A Multi-Pronged Approach to Measurement: The subcommittee is recommending a multi-pronged measurement model that integrates multiple data sets along with measurement of housing progress of a reporting group. This will create an ever-growing group of individuals whose pathways out of encampments and into housing will be well documented. The corresponding metric would be:

- Increase by xx% the number of people moving into interim and permanent housing from unsheltered settings, as measured through the PIT count, the encampment data tool and reporting groups experiencing unsheltered homelessness.

Data Sources—Use of Three Data Sources to Measure Baseline: The subcommittee is recommending the use of three different sets of data sources, working in concert with each other, to develop a baseline. These sources include:

- The annual PIT Count, which will provide a baseline of the number of unsheltered people;
- HMIS, which will provide a number of encampments being tracked;
- HMIS and CHAMP, which will track the number of unsheltered people moving into interim housing and permanent housing.

PIT Count: The Annual PIT Count provides one data point on the number of unsheltered individuals. The PIT provides a rigorous and thorough snapshot at a given time of the population experiencing homelessness, including unsheltered homelessness. The subcommittee recommends using the previous year's unsheltered count as a baseline for each year that this metric is being measured. While the PIT Count presents some limitations, it also has the strength of capturing individuals who may not be engaging in services or may be unseen in other datasets. However, because the PIT only measures a snapshot in time and does not reflect the dynamic, fluid movement of the homeless system, it cannot be the only measurement.

Known Encampments: The region will soon have the ability to track the creation and dissolution of encampments within the Homeless Management Information Services (HMIS) database. Outreach coordinators will draw all encampment boundaries and track the status of the encampments, which will allow tracking of changes over time. The subcommittee recommends looking at the total count of known encampments as a baseline and measure of progress over time. A decrease in the number of encampments will be one indicator demonstrating that people are leaving encampments and not returning to unsheltered homelessness.

Tracking Reporting Groups from Encampments into Housing: The Subcommittee recommends tracking the interim and permanent housing outcomes of any individual associated with an encampment in HMIS. Once an individual has been connected with an encampment, their housing journey will be tracked to measure the percent of individuals leaving encampments and moving into interim and/or permanent housing.

While the original language of Measure A is focused on movement from unsheltered homelessness to permanent housing, the subcommittee is recommending a metric that includes both interim and permanent housing. This will give a better indication of the effectiveness of efforts to move people out of unsheltered homelessness by capturing efforts to move people into interim sites and permanent sites; if the metric were to measure move-ins to only permanent housing, there would not be tracking of people exiting unsheltered homelessness to a sheltered destination, missing an opportunity to provide insight into how people are exiting unsheltered situations on their way to eventually accessing the permanent housing that ends their homelessness..

Once an individual is identified, their progress will be tracked until they enter permanent housing and do not return to homelessness for a period of two years. This will create an ever-growing group of individuals whose pathways out of unsheltered homelessness and into housing will be well documented. Current encampment resolution work throughout the region can create baseline numbers for current movement from encampments into housing. In addition to tracking people exiting encampments, HMIS data will allow these metrics to include people that are unsheltered but not part of an encampment as they move from an unsheltered setting into interim and permanent housing.

This type of multi-pronged measurement model that goes beyond a PIT measure should give an indication of the health and effectiveness of the homeless response system by indicating how expeditiously it identifies individuals in encampments and connects them to resources over set periods of time. By contrast, a model that relies solely on point-in-time measures may not show change in the numbers of people experiencing homelessness even if many people are exiting to interim and permanent housing if the numbers of people falling into homelessness continue to match those exits over the same period of time. This recommended model will measure the effectiveness of efforts to connect people to interim and permanent interventions once they are experiencing homelessness, as opposed to a point-in-time measure which can be distorted by larger forces in the housing market.

Key Terms—Move-Ins to Permanent and/or Interim Housing: Worth noting is that, while the original language of Measure A is focused on movement from unsheltered homelessness to

permanent housing, the subcommittee is recommending a metric that includes both interim and permanent housing. This will give a better indication of the effectiveness of efforts to move people out of unsheltered homelessness by capturing efforts to move people into interim sites and permanent sites; if the metric were to measure move-ins to only permanent housing, there would not be tracking of people exiting unsheltered homelessness to a sheltered destination, missing an opportunity to provide insight into how people are exiting unsheltered situations.

The subcommittee also encountered the following limitations:

Limitations—Permanent Housing and Overall Service Dollars: The subcommittee reflected that one of the major challenges of increasing the number of people moving from encampments to interim and permanent housing is that permanent housing resources are still extremely constrained—as such, goals around producing affordable and supportive housing should be coordinated to ensure new units being produced (or created through rental subsidies) are available and accessible to people experiencing unsheltered homelessness; units that target people at higher incomes are unlikely to be accessible to this population.

Additionally, the subcommittee noted that while this goal calls for an increase in moving people from encampments, the passage of Measure A will not significantly increase the availability of funding to the homeless service system; key components of reducing unsheltered homelessness such as outreach, case management, housing navigation, interim housing beds and services in interim housing will still be funded from a finite set of funds that are unlikely to see major augmentations.

Goal 2: Reduce the number of people with mental illness and/or substance use disorders who experience homelessness

Corresponding Subcommittee: Homelessness Response

Metric—Establishment of a Baseline and Metric to Measure Reduction of People with Mental Illness, Substance Use Disorder Experiencing Homelessness: The subcommittee is currently considering the establishment of one combined metric, which will pull together administrative data on both serious mental illness and substance use disorders to measure reductions in homelessness in this population. The subcommittee recognizes significant overlap between these populations, and that in emergency encounters with people experiencing homelessness, there may sometimes be diagnostic uncertainty as to whether an individual is suffering from serious mental illness, a substance use disorder, or both. The combined metric would be:

- Reduce by xx% the number and proportion of the population experiencing homelessness with serious mental illness and/or substance use disorder.

This combined metric requires the initial establishment of a baseline metric, which would use administrative data from a range of sources (see below) to establish a picture of the entire population experiencing homelessness, and then determine what portion of that population is

suffering from a serious mental illness and/or a substance use disorder. Percentage change reduction targets would then provide a year-over-year goal based off this number. In addition, the subcommittee is considering a recommendation to measure the numbers of people with serious mental illness and/or a substance use disorder who move into permanent housing.

Within this subcommittee, shared definitions were a major endeavor, with terms like “mental illness” encompassing a wide range of definitions.

Key Terms—Serious Mental Illness: The subcommittee recommended defining this term as “a person with bipolar disorder, episodic mood disorder, major depressive disorder, manic episode, other psychotic or delusional disorder, schizophrenic disorder, schizophrenia, or schizotypal disorder.” This has major implications for data measurement, as different definitions of serious mental illness (SMI) can cause significant changes to the percentage of people experiencing homelessness who are determined to suffer from an SMI condition.

This definition does not include people with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). This is not intended to devalue the experience of PTSD and its major impacts or change any eligibility for services for people with PTSD, but recognize that very large proportions of people experiencing homelessness self-report PTSD, making it challenging to measure progress of reducing the number of people with SMI experiencing homelessness if this condition were included.

Broader, inclusive definitions have major impacts on the data. For example, using a broader definition of mental health, the 2023 California Statewide Study of People Experiencing Homelessness found that 66% of people experiencing homelessness reported mental health symptoms. By contrast, a 2020 report from California Policy Lab report using a narrower definition found 17% of unsheltered individuals had received services for an SMI within five years of the survey. These seemingly disparate findings are not at odds with each other but the result of definitional differences.

Data Sources—CHAMP, DMH, SAPC, and PIT Count: The subcommittee is still in the process of recommending how to weave together different data sources for the baseline metric. However, as a foundation, the subcommittee anticipates using six data sources: 1) CHAMP data, 2) Department of Mental Health (DMH) data, 3) Department of Health Services diagnosis data, 4) data from Substance Abuse Prevention and Control (SAPC), which provides SUD funds and programs within the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, 5) HMIS data, and 6) Survey data from the PIT Count.

PIT count demographic survey results estimating how many people experiencing homeless self-report having mental health or substance use issues will be an important source for the baseline metric. The subcommittee recommends evaluating and potentially amending the current PIT survey to ensure it captures information on people’s current mental health and substance use disorder needs that would address their condition in a way that goes beyond the high-level data points currently captured in the PIT survey.

In addition, this subcommittee recommends supplementing PUT with administrative data. Combining both administrative and survey data paints a much more fulsome picture of SMI and

SUD. If the subcommittee were to recommend only using administrative data, the metric would only capture people seeking care who are actively enrolled in programs, missing people with these conditions who are not seeking care for a variety of reasons, including stigma.

Complementing administrative data with survey data may still miss people who are neither seeking care nor reporting their conditions to surveyors, but it is likely to provide a much more robust picture of how many people are suffering from SMI and/or SUDs.

The subcommittee encountered a number of challenges, including:

Limitations—Challenges with Substance Use Data: In general, there are a number of barriers to collecting and accessing accurate substance use disorder (SUD) data. This stems from two primary factors: 1) Privacy considerations for SUD limit access to data, and 2) Stigma and other factors are associated with lower self-reporting of SUD conditions than other types of conditions. Nonetheless, subcommittee members, including DPH leadership, encourage the subcommittee to use all available data to observe this population because, in the past, concerns over data quality have led to this population being left out of major reports and policy discussions.

Goal 3: Increase the number of people permanently leaving homelessness

Corresponding Subcommittee: Homelessness Response

The Homelessness Response subcommittee made the following decisions in developing recommendations:

Metrics—Establishment of a Metric to Measure Permanent Exits from Homelessness:

After defining key terms and identifying data sources, the homelessness response subcommittee recommended a metric for measuring progress on Goal 3:

- Increase by xx% the number of persons who have exited homelessness to a permanent destination and have not returned after two years.

The subcommittee also recommended tracking ‘preliminary returns,’ to reflect people that exited homelessness to permanent housing, but returned to homelessness within the two-year period—with the discrepancy between the ‘preliminary return’ as the formal metric potentially providing illuminating data on how effectively the homeless system is assisting formerly homeless individuals to retain their housing.

The subcommittee recognized that the system needs to track and report exits to a permanent destination in the current year and that policymakers will need data from that year to inform decision making. The subcommittee is recommending to also report current year data on exits to a permanent destination to show the current pace of housing placements.

Key Terms—Definition of Permanent Housing: The subcommittee recommended defining permanent housing as “a community-based housing model, the purpose of which is to provide housing without a designated length of stay.” This is consistent with the definition used by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This choice was intended to ensure a level of quality of housing needed for something to count as “permanent housing,” consistent with federal standards that are adhered to for a range of permanent housing resources such as Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers, Continuum of Care funds, or State of California programs that adhere to federal standards in their housing quality definitions.

Data Sources—HMIS and CHAMP: The subcommittee determined that baseline data would be obtained using administrative data from the HMIS and CHAMP systems.

The subcommittee also encountered the following limitations:

Limitations—Administrative Data and Returns/Self-Resolutions: The subcommittee identified key challenges that included the limits of administrative data, which fails to capture many people exiting homelessness who do so without major interaction with public systems. Additionally, many people touch public systems and receive some form of assistance from public systems to return to housing while “self-resolving” and exiting homelessness back into housing. However, it can be very difficult using existing data to determine the extent to which these services spurred the person’s moving back into housing when these services don’t include housing-based services like housing navigation, time-limited rental subsidies, or supportive housing.

Limitations—Two-Year Observation Window: The subcommittee also grappled with the limited observation window, trying to find balance between the need for regular intervals of data on housing exits being produced within a reasonable time frame to judge progress, while also recognizing that many people may fall back into homelessness after the identified two-year timeframe.

Goal 4: Prevent people from falling into homelessness

Corresponding Subcommittee: Homelessness Prevention

Critical progress on this goal, addressed by the Homelessness Prevention Subcommittee, included recommending a metric for the goal, as well as making critical definitional choices.

Metrics—Establishment of a Metric: The subcommittee is recommending a metric to measure progress on Goal 4, which is:

- Reduce the number of people who become newly homeless (as measured in administrative data) by XX%.

Embedded in this metric, however, are significant definitional choices. These include:

Key Terms—Defining Prevention as Preventing People from Falling into Homelessness at Point of Entry to the Homeless System: This subcommittee, in working to establish a metric to effectively measure a reduction of people falling into homelessness, decided to recommend “homelessness prevention” as prevention programs targeting people at the highest risk of falling into homelessness.

Among policymakers and the public, “homelessness prevention” is often used interchangeably to refer to two distinct concepts. These include:

- 1) Long-term, big-picture homelessness prevention, which seeks to prevent homelessness by ameliorating the conditions of poverty, racism, and unstable housing that lead hundreds of thousands of Angelenos to the brink of crisis every year. Policy responses to this may include work to shore up the effectiveness and resourcing of social safety net programs, increase the stock of affordable housing, or invest in tenant education programs that serve a vulnerable but broad population that goes well-beyond the cohort of individuals that will fall into homelessness in their lifetime.
- 2) Homelessness prevention for people at immediate risk of homelessness, which uses targeting and screening processes to identify people at the greatest risk of becoming homelessness and concentrates resources on that population.

In agreeing upon the second definition, which focuses on a high-risk population, the homelessness prevention subcommittee is recommending to focus resources in a way that will have the most immediately demonstrable impact on the defined goal of reducing people falling into homelessness over the immediate and medium-term. Prevention resources for this group could include cash assistance, rental assistance, eviction prevention, other forms of legal aid, benefits enrollment, workforce services, and other types of support.

Data Sources—Establishing Use of Administrative Data (HMIS & CHAMP) with Complementary Use of PIT Count Data: The subcommittee is also recommending the use of administrative data as the primary way to measure progress towards this goal, utilizing both Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data administered by LAHSA (which tracks individuals who interact with homeless programs), as well as California Health Access Model Program (CHAMP) data, which is administered by Los Angeles County to track interaction with a range of county programs.

However, it is recognized that as homelessness programs expand, the reach of the homeless systems grows and new individuals are identified and enrolled in programs, causing the number of people in administrative systems to rise. This rise can represent an increase in the number of people at immediate risk of homelessness; but these increases can also represent an expansion of services and resources, as programs grow and enroll individuals that were previously being missed by public systems despite their vulnerability. As such, Point-in-Time (PIT) Count data from the Homeless Count are a critical complement to HMIS/CHAMP to determine whether rising numbers are stemming from greater inflow into homelessness or greater availability of homelessness prevention services.

Key Terms—Defining Prevention and Inflow: In addition to the above definition, this subcommittee is recommending to define “homelessness prevention” as preventing new experiences of homelessness, as measured by data collected from homeless service intakes, while defining “inflow” as people who report becoming newly homeless either for the first time or after a period of being housed in homeless system administrative data (HMIS and CHAMP). The subcommittee also encountered the following limitations:

Limitations—Tracking Inflow: The subcommittee grappled with the challenge that there is no universally agreed upon way to track inflow into homelessness (although existing models are being deployed in places like San Francisco and San Diego), and Los Angeles is not comprehensively tracking inflow. Frequently-cited statistics such as “225 people fall into homelessness every day” represent back-of-the-envelope estimates of inflow more so than precise measures. To better track inflow, the subcommittee is recommending the development of an inflow report.

Limitations—Lack of a Targeted Inflow Prevention System: The committee also noted that while some targeted homelessness prevention programs are funded through LAHSA, DHS, and other departments, these programs are scattered and not coordinated with each other. The subcommittee therefore recommends the development of a comprehensive, coordinated prevention system across the region.

Goal 5: Increase the number of affordable housing units in Los Angeles County

Corresponding Subcommittee: Affordable and Supportive Housing

The affordable and supportive housing subcommittee divided their work among three distinct groups:

- Production: This workgroup sought to address the creation of new affordable housing units;
- Preservation: This workgroup sought to address the preservation of existing affordable housing with expiring affordability restrictions; this workgroup did not include “naturally occurring affordable housing,” as there is no formal way to track this stock of housing in a comprehensive way
- Access: This workgroup sought to address the creation of affordable housing through utilizing rental subsidies to access market rate housing units and make their units affordable to people at the lowest incomes.

It should be noted that, while funding for affordable housing production and preservation is included in Measure A, those funds will be directed and allocated at the discretion of the Housing Agency known formally as the Los Angeles County Affordable Housing Solutions Agency (LACAHS), which is following a separate process to plan and allocate funds. In addition, LACAHS will be funding some homeless prevention efforts. The subcommittee

recommends additional work to invite the leadership of LACAHSAs to work with the Leadership Table and the Executive Committee to align these efforts with the metrics established for both Goals 4 and 5.

Data Sources—Unmet Need: The affordable and supportive housing subcommittee recommended establishing a baseline using a modification of the California Housing Partnership’s Housing Needs Dashboard. This indicator uses publicly available census data on housing cost burdens to measure the gap between the total number of very low-income households (50% AMI)⁴ and below, and the number of affordable and available housing units for that population. According to the dashboard, Los Angeles County has a shortage of approximately 500,000 units targeted at very low-income and below households.

However, the subcommittee recognizes the real number of needed units to be significantly higher: because the dashboard is based on housing cost burdens, it does not include people experiencing homelessness, who do not have a housing cost burden (because they do not have housing costs).

Methodology and Metric—Changes in Unmet Need from Baseline Range: The subcommittee recommends using a baseline metric of changes in unmet need, from a baseline of a shortage 500,000 to 550,000 units targeted at people with very low-incomes or below. The recommended metric is:

- Reduce by xx% the baseline of unmet need (500,000-550,000 unit shortage for people with very low-incomes and below), with additional submetrics for production, preservation, and access.

The subcommittee included a higher-range baseline number (550,000 units) to reflect the additional units needed for people experiencing homelessness who do not have a housing cost burden. This will serve as an “umbrella metric” for goal five; however, the subcommittee is currently in the process of developing submetrics for each of the production, preservation, and access subgroups. The subcommittee is also recommending that as units are added, either through production, preservation, or access, they should only be considered as goal-aligned if the unit’s occupants are paying less than 50% of their income on their housing.

It should also be noted that as LACAHSAs develops new affordable housing units, not all newly produced or preserved units may lead to a reduction in this unmet need number—some affordable housing units may be produced for households with higher incomes than the targets established by this subcommittee, such as housing units targeted at low-income households (80% AMI or below).

Key Terms—Permanent Housing: The subcommittee recommended defining housing as only including permanent housing, and not included interim housing units such as tiny homes, other non-congregate shelter beds, or other types of shelter. This comes in recognition that housing is

⁴ Very low income is defined as 50% of Area Median Income or below. These limits are established by HUD on an annual basis for geographies across the country and vary by household size. For Los Angeles County in 2024, the level of Area Median Income for a very low-income household of four (50% AMI or below) is \$69,350, with the Area Median Income for an extremely low-income household of four (30% AMI or below) is \$41,600.

what permanently ends someone's homelessness. While shelter may provide an extremely valuable resource to bring someone away from the harms of the street and into an environment of greater respite, that individual is still experiencing homelessness. Additionally, this aligns with federal definitions of homelessness.

The subcommittee also encountered a number of limitations, including:

Limitations—Data on Preservation: One of the issues facing this subcommittee was existing data on preserving housing that is affordable. While there are data sources on expiring affordability of deed-restricted affordable housing, there is little reliable data on unrestricted market-rate housing that is currently affordable to very low-income households (known as naturally occurring affordable housing, or NOAH). Acquiring and maintaining the affordability of NOAH is a key affordability strategy, but one where it is very challenging to develop an accurate baseline of the existing NOAH stock.

Limitations—Unmet Need Reflects External Factors: Another complication faced by this subcommittee is that the metric that the data source of unmet need, which forms the baseline, is subject to a number of external factors. This metric is an excellent reflection of the conditions of the housing market that are faced by very low- and extremely low-income households; however, this metric may not improve in the face of ramped up affordable housing production if the affordability of existing market rate housing gets worse, causing more households to need deed-restricted housing.

Equity Considerations

It is well documented that there are a number of groups that are disproportionately represented among people experiencing homelessness in the region—most notably, Black and African Americans were 33% of those experiencing homelessness in the Los Angeles Continuum of Care in 2024, while Black people make up only about 8% of the overall population of the county. Other groups, such as American Indian/Alaska Natives (AIAN), are disproportionately represented, while groups such as Latinx people experiencing homelessness are seeing rising numbers.

While there are inequities upstream of the homeless system that create these disproportionate numbers, inequities persist within the homeless response. Research findings from efforts such as the *Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness* have found that Black people experiencing homelessness are disproportionately excluded from receiving system resources. In addition, research from the *Ad Hoc Committee* also showed that Black people are disproportionately likely to fall back into homelessness after receiving housing interventions such as permanent supportive housing.

These inequities cannot be ignored while the Leadership Table and the Executive Committee embark on a goal-setting process to reduce homelessness; failing to address racial inequities in homelessness will ultimately be a failure to address one of the driving forces of homelessness. As with other goals, collecting and reporting baseline data is essential; the subcommittees

recommend that, as the Ad Hoc Data Subcommittee develops report formats, that it includes data within each metric to disaggregate data by race, ethnicity, veteran status, and other demographic factors.

In addition to collecting and reporting metric data disaggregated by race, the subcommittee recommends that, following the creating of numeric targets for each of the metrics, the data subcommittee work with subcommittee chairs to establish additional targets for closing racial and other disparities, with at least corresponding equity goal for each of the five topline goals.

Next Steps

This progress report provides an opportunity for both the Leadership Table and the Executive Committee to understand and respond to the work to date. After discussion at the Leadership Table meeting and Executive Committee meetings in October, subcommittees can use the content of the discussions to refine measures, definitions, and assumptions accordingly. With this completing Phase 1, the urgent work to complete Phase 2 and Phase 3 will continue. As recommended, Phase 2 will require specific direction from the Executive Committee for the Ad Hoc Data Subcommittee to report back in January 2025 with a report format that matches the recommended metrics, includes preliminary baseline measures, and where necessary, recommends alternative metrics.

Finally, this memo recommends convening with the leadership of LACAHSAs to discuss alignment of targets established in Goals 4 and 5 (as well as interaction with targets established in other goals) and ensure there is a process established for this work to inform LACAHSAs's planning and implementation processes.

Appendixes

Full slide decks from subcommittees can be found in the following links:

- [Homelessness Response Ad Hoc Subcommittee](#)
- [Homelessness Prevention Ad Hoc Subcommittee](#)
- [Affordable and Supportive Housing Ad Hoc Subcommittee](#)

Appendix A: Members of Leadership Table Subcommittees

Homeless Prevention Subcommittee	
Name	Entity Represented
Dr. Jackie Contreras, Co-Chair	Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services
Jose Osuna, Co-Chair	Brilliant Corners
Celina Alvarez	Housing Works
Onnig Bulanikian	City of Glendale
Bill Huang	City of Pasadena
Alison King	City of Long Beach
Maria Salinas	Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Brandon Scoggan	Valley Oasis
Janey Rountree	California Policy Lab
Jim Zenner	Los Angeles County Department of Military and Veteran Affairs

Homeless Response Subcommittee and Subgroups	
Name	Entity Represented
Dr. Va Lecia Adams Kellum, Co-Chair	LAHSA
Grant Sunoo, Co-Chair	Little Tokyo Service Center
Celina Alvarez	Housing Works
Alberto Carvalho	LAUSD
La'Toya Cooper	LA Emissary, Lived Expert

Sarah Dusseault	Blue Ribbon Commission on Homelessness, Subject Matter Expert
Giselle Espinoza	LAPD
David Allen Green	SEIU 721
George Greene	Hospital Association of Southern California
Darren Hendon	Veteran Social Services
Stephanie Klasky-Gamer	LA Family Housing
Janey Rountree	California Policy Lab
Maria Salinas	LA Area Chamber of Commerce
Stephanie Wiggins	LA Metro
Lisa Wong	LA County Department of Mental Health
Jim Zenner	Los Angeles County Department of Military and Veteran Affairs

Reducing Unsheltered Homelessness Sugroup

Name	Entity Represented
Dr. Va Lecia Adams Kellum	LAHSA
Elizabeth Boyce	Housing for Health-LA County Department of Health Services
Alberto Carvalho	LAUSD
Ronson Chu	South Bay Cities Council of Governments
La' Toya Cooper	LA Emissary
Giselle Espinosa	LAPD
Darren L Hendon	Veteran Social Services
La Tina Jackson	LA County Department of Mental Health
Bevin Kuhn	LAHSA
Saba Mwine	LAHSA
Andy Perry	LA County CIO
Janey Roundtree	California Policy Lab
Maria S Salinas	LA Area Chamber of Commerce
Jim Zenner	Los Angeles County Department of Military and Veteran Affairs

Increasing Permanent Exits Subgroup

Name	Entity Represented
Celina Alvarez	Housing Works
La' Toya Cooper	LA Emissary
Sarah Dusseault	Blue Ribbon Commission on Homelessness, Subject Matter Expert
Maria Funk	LA County Department of Mental Health
George W. Greene	Hospital Association of Southern California
Craig Joyce	LA Metro
Sarah Mahin	Housing for Health—LA County Department of Health Services
Janice Martin	BASIC Management
Saba Mwine	LAHSA
Andy Perry	LA County CIO
Janey Roundtree	California Policy Labs
Brandon Scoggan	Valley Oasis
Max Stevens	LA County CIO
Grant Sunoo	Little Tokyo Service Center
Stephanie Wiggins	LA Metro
Jim Zenner	Los Angeles County Department of Military and Veteran Affairs

Reducing Homelessness for SMI/SUD Subgroup

Name	Entity Represented
Dr. Va Lecia Adams Kellum	LAHSA
Sarah Dusseault	Blue Ribbon Commission on Homelessness, Subject Matter Expert
David Allen Green	SEIU 721
Maria Funk	LA County Department of Mental Health
La Tina Jackson	LA County Department of Mental Health
Stephanie Klasky Gamer	LA Family Housing
Yanira Lima	Los Angeles County Department of Public Health

Sarah Mahin	Housing for Health-LA County Department of Health Services
Janey Roundtree	California Policy Lab
Max Stevens	LA County CIO
Grant Sunoo	Little Tokyo Service Center
Gary Tsai	Los Angeles County Department of Public Health
Dr. Lisa Wong	LA County Department of Mental Health

Affordable and Supportive Housing Production Subcommittee and Subgroups

Name	Entity Represented
Lourdes Castro Ramirez, co-chair	Office of Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass
Stephanie Klasky-Gamer	LA Family Housing
Kevin Blackburn	Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco
Roberto Chavez	City of Inglewood
Isela Gracian	Office of Supervisor Holly Mitchell
Darren Hendon	Veteran Social Services
Margarita Lares	Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles
Connor Lock	City of Long Beach
Alexis Obinna	Leadership Table: Lived Expert
Jose Osuna	Brilliant Corners
Emilio Salas	Los Angeles Community Development Authority
Miguel Santana	California Community Foundation
Ann Sewill	Los Angeles Housing Department
Grant Sunoo	Little Tokyo Service Center

Affordable Housing Production Subgroup Co-Leads

Name	Entity Represented
Ed Holder	City Administrative Officer, Los Angeles
Ray Mathoda	Anchor Loans

Affordable Housing Preservation Subgroup Co-Leads

Name	Entity Represented
Emilio Salas	Los Angeles Community Development Authority
Ann Sewill	Los Angeles Housing Department

Affordable Housing Access Subgroup Co-Leads

Name	Entity Represented
Margarita Lares	Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles
Leepi Shimkhada	Housing for Health, Los Angeles County Department of Health Services

Appendix B: Key Terms Defined by Subcommittees

- **Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU):** Accessory Dwelling Unit (also known as back unit, granny flat, converted garages, casita, basement apartment).
- **Affordable Housing:** Newly produced or converted housing with restrictions in the funding or other compliance documents that assure longtime affordability of units.
- **At-Risk Properties:** Properties with covenants that are nearing expiration, or covenanted properties with physical-needs that are at risk of being condemned by a government agency, or properties with financial distress (i.e. due to underfunded subsidies).
- **Chronic Homelessness:** People who have experienced homelessness for at least a year — or repeatedly — while struggling with a disabling condition such as a serious mental illness, substance use disorder, or physical disability.
- **Continuum of Care (CoC) Subsidies:** Provides rental assistance for homeless people with disabilities, primarily with serious mental illness, chronic problems with drug and alcohol use and related diseases.
- **Criminalization:** When the US government creates policies or mandates that penalize or punish people impacted by poverty or experiencing homelessness.
- **Crisis Housing:** Emergency Shelter intended to help people quickly exit to permanent housing.
- **Deeply Affordable Housing:** Housing for households making less than 50% AMI that does not require more than 40% of household income towards rent and housing costs.
- **Encampment:** Group of 5 individuals or more sleeping at the same outdoor location for 2 weeks or longer.
- **Exited Homelessness and Did Not Return within Two Years:** A client exited to a permanent destination and did not re-enroll in homeless services within 2 years of exit.
- **Exited Homelessness to a Permanent Destination:** Move in to permanent housing resource in HMIS or CHAMP or exit from a homeless system program to a HUD-defined permanent housing destination.
- **Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool (FHSP):** A Los Angeles County initiative directing funds for unit acquisition, rental payments, and accelerating construction/preservation of housing.
- **High Risk of Homelessness:** A household is determined to be at high risk of homelessness based on evidence-informed factors, screening surveys, or data-driven approaches. Households at high risk are generally earning less than 30% AMI and other have risk factors.

- **Homeless:** [See HUD Definition.](#)
- **Homeless Prevention:** Preventing new experiences of homelessness, as measured by data collected during homeless service intakes.
- **Homeless System Administrative Data:** Data from the HMIS and CHAMP systems.
- **Inflow:** A person who reports becoming newly homeless (either for the first time or after a period of being housed) in homeless system administrative data.
- **Inflow vs. Outflow:** Inflow is defined as the introduction or return of individuals or families into the homeless service system while outflow describes their ability to exit homelessness through access to service, self resolution and/or permanent housing placements.
- **Interim Housing:** Interim Housing provides safe temporary accommodations for people who otherwise have nowhere to spend the night. These may be congregate or non-congregate settings.
- **Landlord Incentives:** Cash bonuses paid to landlords for housing PEH including unit holding fees, damage mitigation payments, security deposits, etc. Locally referred to as the Homeless Incentive Program (HIP). These incentives are tied to landlords accepting rental assistance programs on behalf of tenants.
- **Low-Income Housing Tax Credit:** Tax credits to promote the development and preservation of affordable housing. Housing developers apply for tax credits and Corporations provide equity to build the projects in return for the tax credits.
- **Mental Illness:** A mental disorder is characterized by a clinically significant disturbance in an individual's cognition, emotional regulation, or behavior. It is usually associated with distress or impairment in important areas of functioning.
- **Operating Costs:** The costs of operating an affordable housing unit or building including the costs of acquiring a renter, unit turnover costs (which can be substantial when a mentally challenged renter creates property damage eg., flooding), property management, property maintenance, property insurance, taxes, etc.
- **Outreach:** Street-based Outreach involves experienced teams building relationships with people in encampments and connecting them to housing, healthcare, mental health treatment, and other services.
- **Permanent Housing:** Permanent Housing (PH) is a community-based housing model, the purpose of which is to provide housing without a designated length of stay. (HUD Definition)
- **Preliminary Subtotals (Exited Homelessness):** A client exited to a permanent destination. This subtotal can be calculated 2 years earlier than the final metric.

- **Prevention Services:** services that are targeted to individuals and households at high risk of becoming homeless if they do not get assistance.
- **Production:** Development of newly constructed or renovated *permanent* affordable housing (not including existing units preserved) - excluding transitional housing.
- **Production Costs:** Land acquisition and development, soft costs (design, financing, permitting, approvals), and hard costs (vertical construction through certificate of occupancy. Separate from costs of operating the units after development (property management, vacancy management, etc.)
- **Project-Based Vouchers:** Rental assistance tied to the property for up to 20 years. PBVs require that the property lease to income eligible households.
- **Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA):** HCD determines and distributes regional housing need for each region's Council of Government (COG).
- **Return to Homelessness:** New enrollment in homeless services in HMIS or CHAMP following an exit from homelessness.
- **Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs):** Rental subsidies for tenants to rent units in the private market. HCVs are administered locally by Public Housing Authorities (PHA). PHAs receive federal funds annually from HUD for rent payments and to administer the program.
- **Serious Mental Illness:** A person with bipolar disorder, episodic mood disorder, major depressive disorder, manic episode, other psychotic or delusional disorder, schizoaffective disorder, schizophrenia, or schizotypal disorder. (Note: the definition does not include PTSD as this will not be part of the baseline metric).
- **Services:** Social, mental health counseling, health and other services that are necessary for certain individuals and households to be stable and independent, and the related cost.
- **Sheltered Homelessness:** Someone who is in the "sheltered homeless" category is living in a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter that provides temporary living arrangements. These can be hotels and motels, "congregate" (group) shelters, and transitional housing.
- **Small Residential Unit:** Substantially smaller unit compared to traditional construction/ housing, typically factory built but high quality unit, with 0, 1 or 2 bedrooms. Can be built horizontally (on foundation, or mobile), or stacked in a larger multi-floor development.
- **Substance Use Disorder:** SUD will be defined according to the DSM criteria: A treatable mental disorder that affects a person's brain and behavior, leading to their inability to control their use of substances like legal or illegal drugs, alcohol, or medications.

- **Targeted Eviction Prevention:** Eviction prevention (provided in the form of legal aid, cash assistance, and case management services) provided to individuals and households at high risk of homelessness. Eviction prevention and other types of legal aid are often a component of a holistic homelessness prevention program.
- **Unmet Need:** The mathematical difference between the number of households below 50% AMI and the number of housing units available and affordable for them
- **Unsheltered Homelessness:** An unsheltered homeless person resides in: In a place not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, abandoned buildings (on the street)
- **Veterans:** A person who served in the active military, naval, or air service and who was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable.
- **Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH):** Properties with covenants that are nearing expiration, or covenanted properties with physical-needs that are at risk of being condemned by a government agency, or properties with financial distress (i.e. due to underfunded subsidies).